

Remarks

Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 11-12 and 22 are amended herein. Claims 1-25 remain pending in the Application.

Rejection under 102(e)

Claims 1-25

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-25 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Emens et al. (6606643). Applicant has reviewed Emens et al. and respectfully states that Emens et al. do not anticipate the present invention for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that Claim 1 includes the features "an association of at least one two application service provider servers coupled with said network, said association comprising: a first application service provider for providing a first type of application service; and a second application service provider for providing a second type of application service, wherein said first type of application service is different than said second type of application service". Support for the Claimed feature is clearly shown in the specification including the 6th paragraph of the detailed description.

One example of a service provider application is a request for an outside application service regarding video editing, content edition and enhancement. Another example is a request for an outside application service regarding audio editing, copying and production. That is, the request for application services is a request for an application service provider to perform a service based on the application requested. These features are clearly shown throughout the specification including Figure 6 and Table A and paragraphs [0003], [0017], [0029], [0037], [0042] and [0046].

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Emens et al. anticipates the features of Claim 1. Applicant understands Emens et al. to teach a method for allocating mirrored servers. That is, Applicant understands the mirror server of Emens et al. only provides a replication of the initial host server (column 4 line 15). Therefore, Applicant does not understand Emens et al. to route the client based on an application service request, much less to an associated application service provider. Instead, Applicant understands Emens et al. to provide a mirror server providing the same service as the initial host service.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Emens et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 1, and as such, Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1, 12 and 22 include the feature “service routing server utilizing a predetermined application criteria to intelligently select one of said at least two application service provider servers based on said application request received from said computing device, and intelligently routing the computing device application service request over the network to the selected application service provider server to perform the requested application service”. Support for the Claimed feature is clearly shown in the specification including the 10th paragraph of the detailed description.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Emens et al. anticipates the features of Claims 1, 12 and 22. Applicant understands Emens et al. to teach a method for allocating mirrored servers. That is, Applicant understands the mirror server of Emens et al. only provides a replication of the initial host server (column 4 line 15). Therefore, Applicant does not understand Emens et al. to route the client based on an application service request, much less to an associated application service provider.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Emens et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 12 and 22, and as such, Claims 1, 12 and 22 are in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claim 12, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 12 includes the feature “a monitoring thread for monitoring the outside application server's performance of the service and return of the results to the client.” Support for the Claimed feature is clearly shown in the specification including paragraph [044] of the detailed description.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Emens et al. anticipates the features of Claim 12. Applicant understands Emens et al. to teach a method for allocating mirrored servers. That is, Applicant understands the mirror server of Emens et al. only provides a replication of the initial host server (column 4 line 15). Therefore, Applicant does not understand Emens et al. to route a job from a client to an application service provider and receive a completed result back to the client. Instead, Applicant understands Emens et al. to provide a mirror server providing the same service as the initial host service to the client.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Emens et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 12, and as such, Claim 12 is in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claims 12 and 22, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 12 and 22 include the features “register comprising: a first application service provider description including a first type of application service provided by said first application service provider; and a second application service provider description including a second type of application service provided by said first application service provider, wherein said first type of application service is different than said second type of application service.” Support for the Claimed

feature is clearly shown in the specification including the 6th paragraph of the detailed description.

One example of a service provider application is a request for an outside application service regarding video editing, content edition and enhancement. Another example is a request for an outside application service regarding audio editing, copying and production. That is, the request for application services is a request for an application service provider to perform a service based on the application requested. These features are clearly shown throughout the specification including Figure 6 and Table A and paragraphs [0003], [0017], [0029], [0037], [0042] and [0046].

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Emens et al. anticipates the features of Claims 12 and 22. Applicant understands Emens et al. to teach a method for allocating mirrored servers. That is, Applicant understands the mirror server of Emens et al. only provides a replication of the initial host server (column 4 line 15). Therefore, Applicant does not understand Emens et al. to route the client based on an application service request, much less to an associated application service provider. Instead, Applicant understands Emens et al. to provide a mirror server providing the same service as the initial host service.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Emens et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 12 and 22, and as such, Claims 12 and 22 are in condition for allowance.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Emens et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 12 and 22, and as such, Claims 1, 12 and 22 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Emens et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 2-11 which are dependent on an allowable

Independent Claim 1, Claims 13-21 which are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 12 and Claims 23-25 which are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 22, and that Claims 2-11, 13-21 and 23-25 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 2-11, 13-21 and 23-25 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-25.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 11/9/05


John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060